[21st February 1934

Action taken by the Government on the resolutions passed at the Landholders' Conference held at Puttur, South Kanara district, on 3rd December 1933.

* 650 *Q.*—Mr. A. B. SHETTY: Will the Hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the resolutions passed at the Landholders' Conference held at Puttur in South Kanara on 3rd December 1933 have been received by the Government;

(*b*) whether a copy of the resolutions will be placed on the table of the House; and

(*c*) whether the Government have considered the resolutions and taken any action in regard to them?

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) A copy[a] is annexed.

(*c*) *Resolution I.*—Will be borne in mind (so far as South Kanara is concerned) when the scheme report is taken up for consideration.

Resolution II.—The Government have passed orders in G.O. No. 72, Revenue, dated 10th January 1934.

Resolution III.—The Government have considered and are considering all possible remedies for the effects of the present depression.

Resolution IV.—Is under consideration in the Development Department.

Resolution V.—Contains a request addressed to the Members of the Legislative Council of the district.

Employment of cœrcive measures for the collection of land revenue in South Kanara.

* 651 *Q.*—Khan Bahadur MAHMUD SCHAMNAD SAHIB Bahadur: With reference to the answer to my question No. 381, will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to furnish all the information required in that question ?

A.—The information so far as it is available is given below:—

Clause (*b*) *of question No*. 381.—The land revenue (including arrears) collected in the South Kanara district in fasli 1342 without the attachment of real or personal property was Rs. 27,81,967. (The total land revenue demand of the district including arrears of previous faslis was Rs. 29,61,836.)

Clause (*c*) *of question No*. 381.—The amount realized in the district in fasli 1342 by the sale of personal property was Rupees 14,670 and that realized by the sale of real property was Rs. 12,569.

---

[a] Printed as Appendix IV on pages 107–109 infra.

21st February 1934]

Clause (e) of question No. 381.—The Government have no information other than what is contained in the "Jamabandi Report" which is given below:—

	Estimated value of property sold.	Amount realized.
	RS.	RS.
Real property	22,950	12,569
Personal property	14,687	14,670

Imposition of penal faslijasti rates on inam lands granted for religious purposes.

* 652 *Q.*—Mr. M. D. T. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: Will the Hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) the total extent of ayacut irrigated by the Tinnevelly channel within the Tinnevelly municipal limits at the time of the last settlement;

(*b*) the extent that has been classified as (i) single crop and (ii) double crop at the time of the last settlement;

(*c*) what extent of this area in each class has been taken up by—

(i) the South Indian Railway for permanent way extensions since the last settlement; and

(ii) by the municipality and other private interests for urban usage since the last settlement;

(*d*) what extent of the single crop areas under this ayacut have been converted into (i) double crop wet lands and (ii) given facilities for double crop wet cultivation;

(*e*) what the extent is of single crop land belonging to Sri Rajagopalaswami (inamdar) in this ayacut;

(*f*) whether it was specifically recognized in the settlement of 1874 that religious inam lands should not be charged penal faslijasti rates in the paragraph pertaining to inams of the descriptive memoir of the village of Melaviraraghavapuram, Tinnevelly taluk, Tinnevelly district;

(*g*) on whose initiative and authority was this specific provision relating to a religious inam changed in the new settlement register;

(*h*) whether it is a fact that the omission of the above provision was used as an excuse to penalize double crop cultivation on the lands belonging to Sri Rajagopalaswami temple;

(*i*) whether it is a fact that portions of the inam lands under the same patta are given facilities for double crop cultivation;

(*j*) if so, on what grounds were they given the facilities and why were lands situated lower down, and hence having a better claim, omitted;

(*k*) what the extent is of single crop land enjoying double crop facilities and what the extent is of land charged penal faslijasti rates belonging to Sri Rajagopalaswami temple; and

(*l*) what the principles are that govern the change of single to double crop land in an ayacut and whether the changes so far effected are in strict conformity with these principles?